UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,665	09/04/2003	Walter K. Baur	CHA920030018US1	5364

45095   7590   04/30/2009

HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE ST
14 FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
ALMATRAHI, FARIS S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3627	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-16,18 and 19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-16,18 and 19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1.   This action is in reply to applicant communication filed March 23, 2009.

2.   Claims 1-2, 8-9, 15 and 18 have been amended.

3.   Claims 3 and 17 have been cancelled.

4.   Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-19 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 12-16 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Gryglewicz (US Pat No. 6,993,502) in view of Gallagher et al.

(US Patent No. 7,200,569 B2) and Wilmes et al. (US Patent No. 7,313,538 B2).

7.   Regarding claims 1-2, 8-10, and 15, Gryglewicz discloses a system and method

for processing tax calculation requests, comprising:

- Receiving a tax calculation request in an industry standard format at a tax

  engine (Figures 7-9, Column 15 lines 1-55).

- Identifying and resolving customer-specific extensions in the request (Figures 7-9, Column 15 lines 1-55, Column 2 lines 46-58).

- Selecting one of a plurality of tax calculators to handle the request (Column 9 lines 7-42, Column 26 line 48 – Column 27 line 17); wherein the tax calculator is selected based on a rule defined in the database (Column 18 lines 1-15, Column 21 lines 10-43).

- Translator for translating from the industry standard format to a calculator-specific format for the selected tax calculator (Column 26 line 48 – Column 27 line 17, Column 37 lines 25-36).

- Using the selected tax calculator to process the request in the calculator-specific format (Figures 7-9, Column 26 line 48 – Column 27 line 17).

8.   Gryglewicz fails to explicitly disclose a plurality of tax calculators to handle the request each calculator configured to calculate a different tax and a plurality of updatable tax tables stored in a single location with the plurality of tax calculators; and wherein the translator is translating a tax calculation request from an industry standard format to a non-industry standard format required for the selected tax calculator of the plurality of tax calculators.

9.   Wilmes discloses a tax calculation system and method comprising a plurality of tax calculators to handle the request each calculator configured to calculate a different tax (Paragraph [0097]); and a plurality of updatable tax tables stored in a single location with the plurality of tax calculators (Column 6 lines 40-60, Claim 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Wilmes in the device of Gryglewicz reference to include a tax calculation system and method comprising selecting one of a plurality of tax calculators to handle the request each calculator configured to calculate a different tax and a plurality of updatable tax tables stored in a single location with the plurality of tax calculators, for the advantage of allowing multiple taxing authorities to coexist on a single server.

10.   Gallagher teaches a system and method comprising translating a tax calculation request from an industry standard format to a non-industry standard format (Column 18 lines 28-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Gallagher in the device of Gryglewicz reference to include a tax calculation system and method wherein the translator is translating a tax calculation request from an industry standard format to a non-industry standard format required for the selected tax calculator of the plurality of tax calculators, for the advantage of utilizing and easily converting between standardized formats.

11.   <u>Regarding Claims 4, 11, and 19</u>, Gryglewicz fails to explicitly disclose a tax calculation system and method wherein the industry standard format comprises 3Y4 XML.

12.   However, Gallagher discloses a tax calculation system and method wherein the standard format comprises XML format (Column 18 lines 28-67).

13.   Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Gallagher in the device of Gryglewicz reference to include a tax calculation system and method wherein the industry standard format comprises 3Y4 XML, for the advantage of utilizing and easily converting between standardized formats.

14.   Regarding claims 5, 12, and 18, Gryglewicz discloses a tax calculation system and method wherein at least one of the tax calculators is for a specific geographic region (Figure 11, Column 26 lines 32-47).

15.   Regarding claims 6 and 13, Gryglewicz discloses a tax calculation system and method comprising an update system for updating customer-specific extensions and rules (Column 8 lines 19-53, Column 20 lines 14-30).

16.   Regarding claims 7, 14, and 16, Gryglewicz discloses a tax calculation system and method wherein the tax engine resides on a computer network (Column 8 lines 8-18).

Response to Arguments

17.   Applicant's arguments filed on March 23, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive

18.   Regarding Applicants arguments that Gryglewicz fails to teach a translator for translating the tax calculation requests from the industry standard format to the non-industry standard format required for the selected tax calculator of the plurality of tax calculators. Applicant's argument is moot in view of new ground of rejection.

19.   Regarding Applicants arguments that Gryglewicz in view of Wilmes fail to teach a table update system configured to receive updates for the plurality of tax tables and update the plurality of tax tables. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wilmes discloses a plurality of updatable tax tables stored in a single location with the plurality of tax calculators in Column 6 lines 40-60, and discloses updating tax information including tax rates and stored tax calculation rules in Claim 1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faris Almatrahi whose telephone number is (571) 270-3326. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Faris Almatrahi/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

FA

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627